arXiv:1406.1269v1 [math.MG] 5 Jun 2014

Doubling measures on uniform Cantor sets*

Chun WEI, Shengyou WEN,† and Zhixiong WEN

June 6, 2014

Abstract

We obtain a complete description for a probability measure to be doubling on an arbitrarily given uniform Cantor set. The question of which doubling measures on such a Cantor set can be extended to a doubling measure on $[0, 1]$ is also considered.

Keywords Uniform Cantor Set, Doubling Measure, Extension
2010 MSC: 28A12 (Primary), 30L10 (Secondary)

1 Introduction

It is well known that every complete doubling metric space carries a doubling measure [7, 9, 16] and that doubling measures are rich when the underlying doubling metric space has no dense isolated points [8]. In the Euclidean n-space, a measure, defined by integrating an A_∞ weight, is doubling [4]. These measures form a subclass of absolutely continuous doubling measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Examples of singular doubling measures can be obtained from self-similar measures on the unit square [3, 20]. The existence of singular doubling measures have also been studied extensively in general metric spaces [8, 15, 19]. Recall that a Borel regular measure μ on a metric space X is doubling, if there is a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$0 < \mu(B(x, 2r)) \leq C\mu(B(x, r)) < \infty \text{ for all } x \in X \text{ and } r > 0. \tag{1}$$

Doubling measures naturally arise in the study of the gradients of convex functions on the Euclidean n-space. See [10, 11], where it is showed that, in many cases, the gradient of a convex function is a quasisymmetric self-homeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}^n$, by which the pullback measure of the Lebesgue measure is doubling. Doubling measures can be applied to classify subsets of a metric space, in which, for example, a subset is called very thin, if it is null for all doubling measures on the metric space. This leads to the study on fat and thin sets [1, 5, 12]. Doubling measures can also be used to construct quasisymmetric

*Supported by the NSFC (Nos. 11271114 and 10971056).
†Corresponding author. E-mail: sywen_65@163.com

deformations of the underlying metric space, so that the objective space is in some sense better than the original space, for example, it can be proved that, if a metric space is uniformly perfect and carries a doubling measure, then it is quasisymmetrically equivalent to an Ahlfors regular space [6].

Though examples of doubling measures are rich, a complete description for doubling measures on a given metric space is usually difficult. It is clear that a measure on the real line $\mathbb{R}$ is doubling if and only if it is a pullback measure of a quasisymmetric self-homeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}$. However, this is not true for higher dimensional Euclidean space. In the present paper, we study doubling measures on uniform Cantor sets. We shall give a sufficient and necessary condition for the doubling property of a measure on an arbitrarily given uniform Cantor set. The question of which doubling measure on such a Cantor set can be extended to a doubling measure on $[0,1]$ is also discussed. For the related papers on Cantor sets and doubling measures on $[0,1]$, we refer to [2, 13, 14, 17].

We begin with uniform Cantor sets. Let $\mathbf{n} = \{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of integers, where $n_k \geq 2$. Let $\mathbf{c} = \{c_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of real numbers in $(0,1)$ such that $(n_k - 1)c_k < 1$ for all $k \geq 1$. The uniform Cantor set $E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c})$ is defined by

$$E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c}) = \bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} E_k, \tag{2}$$

where $\{E_k\}$ is a sequence of nested compact sets in $[0,1]$, $E_0 = [0,1]$, and E_k is obtained by deleting from every component I of E_{k-1} $(n_k - 1)$ open intervals of equal length $c_k|I|$, such that the remaining n_k closed intervals are of equal length. A component of E_k will be called a component of level k and a component of $E_{k-1} \setminus E_k$ will be called a gap of level k. Denote by N_k, δ_k, and ε_k, respectively, the number of components of level k, the length of a component of level k, and the length of a gap of level k. Then, from the definition

$$N_k = \prod_{i=1}^{k} n_i, \quad \delta_k = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1 - (n_i - 1)c_i}{n_i}, \quad \varepsilon_k = c_k \delta_{k-1}. \tag{3}$$

Note that the uniform Cantor set $E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c})$ is of Lebesgue measure

$$\mathcal{L}(E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c})) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 - (n_i - 1)c_i).$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{L}(E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c})) > 0 \Leftrightarrow \{n_k c_k\} \in \ell^1, \tag{4}$$

where ℓ^p denotes the set of real sequences $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ with $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |a_k|^p < \infty$.

For a uniform Cantor set $E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c})$ we denote by $\mathcal{I}_k$ the family of its components of level k and by $\mathcal{G}_k$ the family of its gaps of level k. Then $\sharp\mathcal{I}_k = N_k$ and $\sharp\mathcal{G}_k = N_{k-1}(n_k - 1)$, where $\sharp$ denotes the cardinality. Let $\mathcal{I} = \cup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{I}_k$ and $\mathcal{G} = \cup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_k$. To label these components and gaps, we relate a word to each of them as follows: Let

$$W_k = \{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_k : 1 \leq i_j \leq n_j, 1 \leq j \leq k\} \text{ and } W = \cup_{k=1}^{\infty} W_k. \tag{5}$$

A member in W_k is called a word of length k and a member in W is called a word of finite length. Let the words in W be ordered in the lexicographic order. Then the first n_1 words are $1, 2, \cdots, n_1$. We denote, from left to right, by $I_1, I_2, \cdots, I_{n_1}$ the n_1 components in $\mathcal{I}_1$ and by $G_1, G_2, \cdots, G_{n_1-1}$ the n_1-1 gaps in $\mathcal{G}_1$. Inductively, supposing that I_w has been defined for a word $w \in W_{k-1}$, we denote, from left to right, by $I_{w1}, I_{w2}, \cdots, I_{wn_k}$ the n_k members of $\mathcal{I}_k$ in I_w and by $G_{w1}, G_{w2}, \cdots, G_{w(n_k-1)}$ the $n_k - 1$ members of $\mathcal{G}_k$ in I_w. With the above notation, once a word $w \in W_k$ is specified, the relative position of the component I_w of level k is determined. For example, the minimal word $11\cdots1$ of length k corresponds to the leftmost component in $\mathcal{I}_k$ and the maximal word $n_1n_2\cdots n_k$ of length k corresponds to the rightmost component in $\mathcal{I}_k$. We say that two components I_w and I_u are adjacent, if $w, u \in W$ are adjacent in the sense of the lexicographic order. For example, given $w \in W_{k-1}$ and $1 \le i < n_k$, the maximal word $win_{k+1}\cdots n_{k+t}$ of length $k+t$ with prefix wi and the minimal word $w(i+1)1\cdots1$ of length $k+t$ with prefix $w(i+1)$ are adjacent. They correspond to two adjacent components in $\mathcal{I}_{k+t}$. Note that

$$E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c}) = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\omega \in W_k} I_\omega$$

and that

$$I_\omega = I_{w1} \cup G_{w1} \cup I_{w2} \cup G_{w2} \cup \cdots \cup I_{w(n_k-1)} \cup G_{w(n_k-1)} \cup I_{wn_k}$$

for all $w \in W_{k-1}$, where, if $k = 1$, then $I_w = [0, 1]$ and $wi = i$.

We also need some terminology on vectors. A vector $P = (p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_k)$ is called a positive probability, if its components are all positive and $\sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i = 1$. A positive probability vector $P = (p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_k)$ is called C-uniform, where $C \ge 1$ is a constant, if

$$C^{-1} \le \frac{p_{i+1} + \cdots + p_{i+l}}{p_{j+1} + \cdots + p_{j+l}} \le C \text{ whenever } 0 \le i \le j \le i + l \le j + l \le k. \quad (6)$$

The condition means that two of sums of consecutive l components of P are comparable, if they are adjacent. Clearly, the vector P is 1-uniform if and only if $p_1 = p_2 = \cdots = p_k$. We say that P is (C, s)-uniform, where $1 \le s \le k$, if the condition (6) holds only for $s \le l \le k$. Thus, the $(C, 1)$-uniformness and the C-uniformness are the same. We say that a sequence $\mathbb{P} = \{P_k\}$ of positive probability vectors is C-uniform, if each P_k is C-uniform. We say that $\mathbb{P}$ is ultimately C-uniform, if there is an integer $k_0 \ge 1$ such that P_k is C-uniform for each $k \ge k_0$.

Let $E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c})$ be a uniform Cantor set. Let $\mathbb{P} = \{P_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of positive probability vectors, where

$$P_k = (p_{k,1}, p_{k,2}, \cdots, p_{k,n_k})$$

has n_k components. Such a sequence of vectors will be called $\mathbf{n}$-matching. Given an $\mathbf{n}$-matching sequence $\mathbb{P}$ of vectors, there is a unique probability measure on

$E(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{c})$, denoted by $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$, satisfying

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wi}) = p_{k,i}\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_w) \text{ for all } w \in W_{k-1} \text{ and } 1 \le i \le n_k. \tag{7}$$

The positivity assumption of probability vectors is reasonable. Otherwise, the corresponding measure would support on a proper compact subset of $E(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{c})$.

The following data of the uniform Cantor set $E(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{c})$ are crucial in stating our results. Denote

$$\Lambda = \{k \ge 1 : \varepsilon_k < \delta_k\}. \tag{8}$$

Thus, a gap in $\mathcal{G}_k$ is shorter than a component in $\mathcal{I}_k$ at every level $k \in \Lambda$. For each $k \in \Lambda$ let m_k be the unique positive integer such that

$$\delta_{k+m_k} \le \varepsilon_k < \delta_{k+m_k-1}. \tag{9}$$

and let s_k be the unique positive integer such that

$$s_k\delta_{k+m_k} + (s_k-1)\varepsilon_{k+m_k} \le \varepsilon_k < (s_k+1)\delta_{k+m_k} + s_k\varepsilon_{k+m_k}. \tag{10}$$

Write $E(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{c},\Lambda,\{m_k\}_{k\in\Lambda},\{s_k\}_{k\in\Lambda})$ for $E(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{c})$, when these related data are emphasized.

Theorem 1. *Let $E = E(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{c},\Lambda,\{m_k\}_{k\in\Lambda},\{s_k\}_{k\in\Lambda})$ be a uniform Cantor set. Let $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ be a measure determined by an $\mathbf{n}$-matching sequence $\mathbb{P}$ of positive probability vectors. Then $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ is doubling on E if and only if there is a constant $C > 1$ such that $\mathbb{P}$ is C-uniform and satisfies, for each $k \in \Lambda$, the following conditions:*

(a) (P_{k+t}, P_{k+t}) is C-uniform and

$$C^{-1}\prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{k+j,1} \le \prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{k+j,n_{k+j}} \le C\prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{k+j,1} \text{ for all } \ 1 \le t < m_k. \tag{11}$$

(b) (P_{k+m_k}, P_{k+m_k}) is (C, s_k)-uniform.

Hereafter, if $P = (p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_j)$, then $(P,P) = (p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_j, p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_j)$.

From theorem 1 some easier conditions for the doubling property of the measure $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ on E can be formulated.

Corollary 1. *If $\sup_{k\ge1} n_k < \infty$, then the measure $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ is doubling on E if and only if there is a constant $C > 1$ such that*

(a) $C^{-1}p_{k,i} \le p_{k,i+1} \le Cp_{k,i}$ for all $1 \le i < n_k$ and for all k, and

(b) the condition (11) is satisfied for all $1 \le t < m_k$ and for all $k \in \Lambda$.

Corollary 2. *If $\sup_{k\in\Lambda} m_k < \infty$, then the measure $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ is doubling on E if and only if there is a constant $C > 1$ such that*

(a) $\mathbb{P}$ is C-uniform, and

(b) for every integer $k \in \Lambda$, (P_{k+t}, P_{k+t}) is C-uniform for all $1 \le t < m_k$ and (P_{k+m_k}, P_{k+m_k}) is (C, s_k)-uniform.

Corollary 3. *If $\mathbb{P}$ is ultimately 1-uniform, then $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ is doubling on E.*

Theorem 1 can be generalized. Let μ be a Borel probability measure on E with $\mu(I_w) > 0$ for all $w \in W$. For each $k \geq 1$ and for each $w \in W_{k-1}$ let

$$p_{wi} = \frac{\mu(I_{wi})}{\mu(I_w)},\ 1 \leq i \leq n_k. \tag{12}$$

Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of Borel probability measures μ on E, with $\mu(I_w) > 0$ for all $w \in W$, and the set of sequences $\{p_w\}_{w\in W}$, with $\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} p_{wi} = 1$ and $0 < p_{wi} < 1$ for all $w \in W_{k-1}$ and $k \geq 1$. Write

$$P_w = (p_{w1}, p_{w2}, \cdots, p_{wn_k}) \tag{13}$$

for each $w \in W_{k-1}$. Then μ is a measure considered in theorem 1, provided that for every fixed integer $k \geq 1$, the vectors P_w are the same for all $w \in W_{k-1}$. Write wiu_t for the maximal word in W_{k+t} with prefix wi and $wi1^t$ the minimal word in W_{k+t} with prefix wi. Our next theorem gives a complete description of doubling measures on a uniform Cantor set.

Theorem 2. *Let $E = E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c}, \Lambda, \{m_k\}_{k\in\Lambda}, \{s_k\}_{k\in\Lambda})$ be a uniform Cantor set. Let μ be a Borel probability measure on E with $\mu(I_w) > 0$ for all $w \in W$. Let $\{p_w\}_{w\in W}$ be the corresponding sequence. Then μ is doubling on E if and only if there is a constant $C > 1$ such that P_w is C-uniform for all $w \in W$ and satisfies, for each $k \in \Lambda$, the following conditions:*

(a) $(P_{wiu_{t-1}}, P_{w(i+1)1^{t-1}})$ is C-uniform and

$$C^{-1} \prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{wiu_j} \leq \prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{w(i+1)1^j} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{wiu_j} \tag{14}$$

for all $w \in W_{k-1}$, $1 \leq i < n_k$, and $1 \leq t < m_k$.

(b) $(P_{wiu_{m_k-1}}, P_{w(i+1)1^{m_k-1}})$ is (C, s_k)-uniform.

For a uniform Cantor set $E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c})$ it is known that $\nu(E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c})) = 0$ for all doubling measures ν on $[0, 1]$ if and only if $\{n_k c_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \notin \cup_{q\geq 1} \ell^q$ [5]. As a consequence, if $E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c})$ carries a doubling measure which can be extended to a doubling measure on $[0, 1]$, then $\{n_k c_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \in \cup_{q\geq 1} \ell^q$. Our main result on the extension question of doubling measures on a uniform Cantor set is the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *Let $E = E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c})$ be a uniform Cantor set. Let $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ be a measure determined by an ultimately 1-uniform $\mathbf{n}$-matching sequence $\mathbb{P}$ of positive probability vectors. Then $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ can be extended to a doubling measure on $[0, 1]$ if and only if $\{n_k c_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \in \ell^1$.*

2 Proof of Theorem 1

In what follows C will denote a constant depending only on the constants in question and it may be different in every appearance. Write $A \sim B$ for $C^{-1}B \leq$

$A \le CB$, and $A \preceq B$ for $A \le CB$, when A, B are quantities. For an interval I, denote by $x^-(I)$ and $x^+(I)$, respectively, the left and the right endpoints of I.

Proof of the 'only if' part. Let $E = E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c}, \Lambda, \{m_k\}_{k\in\Lambda}, \{s_k\}_{k\in\Lambda})$ be a uniform Cantor set. Let $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ be a measure determined by an $\mathbf{n}$-matching sequence $\mathbb{P}$ of positive probability vectors. Suppose that $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ is doubling on E. We are going to show that the sequence $\mathbb{P}$ satisfies the conditions of theorem 1. The doubling property of the measure $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ will be used frequently in the following equivalent form:

$$\mu(B(x,r)) \sim \mu(B(y,t)) \text{ for all } x, y \in E \text{ and } r, s > 0 \text{ with } |x-y| \preceq r \sim s.$$

Note that, for all $k \ge 1$, the endpoints of components of level k of E belong to E. The proof consists of the following claims.

Claim 1. $p_{k,2} \le Cp_{k,1}$ and $p_{k,n_k-1} \le Cp_{k,n_k}$ for all $k \ge 1$.

Proof of Claim 1. Let $w \in W_{k-1}$ be the minimal word of length $k-1$. Then the corresponding component I_w is the leftmost component of level $k-1$. We easily see that

$$I_{w1} = E_k \cap B(x^-(I_{w1}), \delta_k + \varepsilon_k) \text{ and } I_{w2} \subseteq B(x^-(I_{w2}), \delta_k + \varepsilon_k).$$

Observing that $x^-(I_{w1}), x^-(I_{w2}) \in E$ and $|x^-(I_{w1}) - x^-(I_{w2})| = \delta_k + \varepsilon_k$, it follows from the doubling property of $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ that

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w2}) \le \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x^-(I_{w2}), \delta_k + \varepsilon_k)) \le C\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x^-(I_{w1}), \delta_k + \varepsilon_k)) = C\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w1}),$$

giving $p_{k,2} \le Cp_{k,1}$ by (7). Similarly, we have $p_{k,n_k-1} \le Cp_{k,n_k}$ by considering the maximal word $w \in W_{k-1}$ and the rightmost two components of level k. This proves claim 1.

Claim 2. $p_{k,i} \sim p_{k,i+1}$ for all $1 \le i < n_k$ and $k \ge 1$.

Proof of Claim 2. Let k be given. When $n_k = 2$, claim 2 follows from claim 1 directly. Next we assume that $n_k > 2$. Consider the components I_{wi} and $I_{w(i+1)}$ of level k, where $w \in W_{k-1}$ and $1 \le i < n_k$. Then G_{wi} is the gap of level k between them. Three possible cases may happen.

Case 1. $\varepsilon_k \ge \delta_k$.

Since $\varepsilon_k \ge \delta_k$, we easily see that

$$I_{wi} = E_k \cap B(x^+(I_{wi}), \varepsilon_k) \text{ and } I_{w(i+1)} = E_k \cap B(x^-(I_{w(i+1)}), \varepsilon_k) \tag{15}$$

for $1 < i < n_k - 1$. Observing that $x^+(I_{wi}), x^-(I_{w(i+1)}) \in E$ and $|x^+(I_{wi}) - x^-(I_{w(i+1)})| = \varepsilon_k$, we get from doubling property of $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ that

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wi}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w(i+1)}),$$

which yields $p_{k,i} \sim p_{k,i+1}$ by (7). For $i = 1$, letting w be the minimal word in W_{k-1}, the relationship (15) remains to be true, and so $p_{k,1} \sim p_{k,2}$. For

$i = n_k - 1$, considering the maximal word in W_{k-1}, we get $p_{k,n_k-1} \sim p_{k,n_k}$ in the same way.

Case 2. $\varepsilon_k < \delta_k$ and $n_{k+1} > 2$.

Consider balls $B(x, r)$ and $B(y, r)$, where

$$x = x^-(G_{wi}) - r,\ y = x^+(G_{wi}) + r,\ r = [\frac{n_{k+1} - 1}{2}](\delta_{k+1} + \varepsilon_{k+1}).$$

We see that x is an endpoint of a component of level $k+1$ in I_{wi} and that y is an endpoint of a component of level $k+1$ in $I_{w(i+1)}$, so $x, y \in E$. Note also that

$$B(x, r) \subseteq I_{wi} \text{ and } B(y, r) \subseteq I_{w(i+1)}.$$

Since $n_{k+1} \geq 3$, we have $4[\frac{n_{k+1}-1}{2}] \geq n_{k+1}$, so $4r > \delta_k$, giving

$$I_{wi} \subseteq B(x, 4r) \text{ and } I_{w(i+1)} \subseteq B(y, 4r).$$

Therefore

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wi}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x, r)) \text{ and } \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w(i+1)}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(y, r)).$$

Additionally, since $\varepsilon_k < \delta_k$ has been assumed, we have $|x - y| = 2r + \varepsilon_k \leq 6r$, so $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x, r)) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(y, r))$ by the doubling property of $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$. It then follows that $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wi}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w(i+1)})$, giving $p_{k,i} \sim p_{k,i+1}$ by (7).

Case 3. $\varepsilon_k < \delta_k$ and $n_{k+1} = 2$.

In the case of $\varepsilon_{k+1} \geq \delta_{k+1}$, consider $B(x^-(I_{wi2}), r)$ and $B(x^+(I_{w(i+1)1}), r)$, where $r = \delta_{k+1} + \frac{\varepsilon_k}{3}$. Since $r < \delta_{k+1} + \frac{\delta_k}{3} \leq \delta_{k+1} + \varepsilon_{k+1}$, we see that

$$I_{wi2} \subseteq E_k \cap B(x^-(I_{wi2}), r) \subseteq I_{wi}$$

and

$$I_{w(i+1)1} \subseteq E_k \cap B(x^+(I_{w(i+1)1}), r) \subseteq I_{w(i+1)}.$$

Observing that $|x^+(I_{w(i+1)1} - x^-(I_{wi2})| = 2\delta_{k+1} + \varepsilon_k \leq 3r$, we get from the doubling property of $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ that

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x^-(I_{wi2}), r)) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x^+(I_{w(i+1)1}), r)).$$

Since $n_{k+1} = 2$, we have $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wi2}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wi})$ and $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w(i+1)1}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w(i+1)})$ by claim 1. Therefore $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wi}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w(i+1)})$, and so $p_{k,i} \sim p_{k,i+1}$ by (7).

In the case of $\varepsilon_{k+1} < \delta_{k+1}$, since $n_{k+1} = 2$, we have

$$B(x^-(I_{wi2}), \delta_{k+1}) \subseteq I_{wi} \subseteq B(x^-(I_{wi2}), 3\delta_{k+1})$$

and

$$B(x^+(I_{w(i+1)1}), \delta_{k+1}) \subseteq I_{w(i+1)} \subseteq B(x^+(I_{w(i+1)1}), 3\delta_{k+1}).$$

Since $\varepsilon_k < \delta_k$, we get $|x^+(I_{w(i+1)1} - x^-(I_{wi2})| = 2\delta_{k+1} + \varepsilon_k \le 5\delta_{k+1}$. Then $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wi}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w(i+1)})$ by the doubling property of $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$, giving $p_{k,i} \sim p_{k,i+1}$. This completes the proof of claim 2.

Claim 3. $\mathbb{P}$ is C-uniform.

Proof of Claim 3. Since the C-uniformness of $\mathbb{P}$ is equivalent to that every P_k satisfies

$$p_{k,i+1} + \cdots + p_{k,i+l} \sim p_{k,i+l+1} + \cdots + p_{k,i+2l} \tag{16}$$

for all $i \ge 0$ and $l \ge 1$ with $i + 2l \le n_k$, it suffices to show (16). Fix k. When $l = 1$ or $n_k \le 3$, the relationship (16) follows from claim 2 directly. Next we assume that $l \ge 2$ and $n_k > 3$. Let $w \in W_{k-1}$ and $i \ge 0$ be given such that $i + 2l \le n_k$. Observing that there are balls $B(x, r)$ and $B(y, r)$ with $x, y \in E$ and $|x - y| \le 3r$ such that

$$E_k \cap B(x, r) \subseteq I_{w(i+1)} \cup \cdots \cup I_{w(i+j)} \subseteq B(x, 3r)$$

and

$$E_k \cap B(y, r) \subseteq I_{w(i+j+1)} \cup \cdots \cup I_{w(i+2j)} \subseteq B(y, 3r),$$

we immediately get

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w(i+1)} \cup \cdots \cup I_{w(i+j)}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w(i+j+1)} \cup \cdots \cup I_{w(i+2j)}),$$

giving the relationship (16) by (7). This completes the proof of claim 3.

Claim 4. $\prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{k+j,1} \sim \prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{k+j,n_{k+j}}$ for all $k \in \Lambda$ and $1 \le t < m_k$.

Proof of Claim 4. Let $k \in \Lambda$ be fixed. Without loss of generality, assume that $m_k > 1$. Let $1 \le t < m_k$ be given. Then $\varepsilon_k < \delta_{k+t}$ by the definition of m_k. Let $w \in W_{k-1}$ and $1 \le i < n_k$ be given. Let $wiu \in W_{k+t}$ be the maximal word with prefix wi and $w(i+1)v \in W_{k+t}$ be the minimal word with prefix $w(i+1)$. Then, by (7)

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wiu}) = \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_w) p_{k,i} \prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{k+j,n_{k+j}}$$

and

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w(i+1)v}) = \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_w) p_{k,i+1} \prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{k+j,1}.$$

Note that the gap between I_{wiu} and $I_{w(i+1)v}$ is G_{wi}. Since $\varepsilon_k < \delta_{k+t}$, one has $|G_{wi}| < |I_{wiu}| = |I_{w(i+1)v}|$. To complete this proof, we consider two cases:

Case 1. $n_{k+t+1} > 2$.

Arguing as case 2 of claim 2, we have two balls, $B(x, r)$ and $B(y, r)$, with $x, y \in E$ and $|x - y| \le 6r$, such that

$$B(x, r) \subseteq I_{wiu} \subseteq B(x, 4r) \text{ and } B(y, r) \subseteq I_{w(i+1)v} \subseteq B(y, 4r),$$

which, combined with the doubling property of $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$, yields $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wiu}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w(i+1)v})$.

Case 2. $n_{k+t+1} = 2$.

Consider two subcases: $\varepsilon_{k+t+1} \geq \delta_{k+t+1}$ and $\varepsilon_{k+t+1} < \delta_{k+t+1}$. In the first subcase, arguing as case 3 of claim 2, we have two balls, $B(x,r)$ and $B(y,r)$, with $x, y \in E$ and $|x-y| \leq 3r$, such that

$$I_{wiu2} \subseteq E_{k+t} \cap B(x,r) \subseteq I_{wiu} \text{ and } I_{w(i+1)v1} \subseteq E_{k+t} \cap B(y,r) \subseteq I_{w(i+1)v}.$$

In the second subcase, arguing as case 3 of claim 2, we have two balls, $B(x,r)$ and $B(y,r)$, with $x, y \in E$ and $|x-y| \leq 5r$, such that

$$B(x,r) \subseteq I_{wiu} \subseteq B(x,3r) \text{ and } B(y,r) \subseteq I_{w(i+1)v} \subseteq B(y,3r).$$

Therefore, in both subcases, we have $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wiu}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w(i+1)v})$.

Now $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wiu}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{w(i+1)v})$ is proved. Since $p_{k,i} \sim p_{k,i+1}$ has been proved in claim 2, we get $\prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{k+j,1} \sim \prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{k+j,n_{k+j}}$. This completes the proof of claim 4.

Claim 5. (P_{k+t}, P_{k+t}) is C-uniform for all $k \in \Lambda$ and $1 \leq t < m_k$.

Proof of Claim 5. Since $\mathbb{P}$ has been proved to be C-uniform, it suffices to show that the sum of the first j terms of P_{k+t} is comparable to the sum of the last j terms of P_{k+t} for all $k \in \Lambda$, $1 \leq t < m_k$, and $1 \leq j \leq n_{k+t}$. Let these integers be given. Let $w \in W_{k-1}$ and $1 \leq i < n_k$ be given. Let $u \in W_{k+t-1}$ be the maximal word with prefix wi and $v \in W_{k+t-1}$ be the minimal word with prefix $w(i+1)$. Then G_{wi} is the gap between I_u and I_v. Consider components $I_{un_{k+t}}$, $I_{u(n_{k+t}-1)}, \cdots$, $I_{u(n_{k+t}+1-j)}$ and I_{v1}, I_{v2}, $\cdots$, I_{vj} of level $k+t$. Since $\varepsilon_k < \delta_{k+t}$, by the same argument as that of claim 3 we get

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{un_{k+t}} \cup \cdots \cup I_{u(n_{k+t}+1-j)}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{v1} \cup \cdots \cup I_{vj}),$$

which, together with (7), yields

$$p_{k+t,n_{k+t}} + \cdots + p_{k+t,n_{k+t}+1-j} \sim p_{k+t,1} + \cdots + p_{k+t,j}.$$

This completes the proof of claim 5.

Claim 6. (P_{k+m_k}, P_{k+m_k}) is (C, s_k)-uniform for all $k \in \Lambda$.

Proof of Claim 6. Since $\mathbb{P}$ has been proved to be C-uniform, it suffices to show that the sum of the first j terms of P_{k+m_k} is comparable to the sum of the last j terms of P_{k+m_k} for all $k \in \Lambda$ and $s_k \leq j \leq n_{k+m_k}$, where, by the definition, s_k satisfies

$$s_k\delta_{k+m_k} + (s_k - 1)\varepsilon_{k+m_k} \leq \varepsilon_k < (s_k+1)\delta_{k+m_k} + s_k\varepsilon_{k+m_k}.$$

Let k and j be given. Let $w \in W_{k-1}$ and $1 \leq i < n_k$. Let $u \in W_{k+m_k-1}$ be the maximal word with prefix wi and let $v \in W_{k+m_k-1}$ be the minimal word with prefix $w(i+1)$. Then G_{wi} is the gap between $I_{un_{k+m_k}}$ and I_{v1}.

Case 1. $s_k = j = 1$. In this case, $\delta_{k+m_k} \le \varepsilon_k \le 2\delta_{k+m_k} + \varepsilon_{k+m_k}$, so we have

$$I_{un_{k+m_k}} \subseteq E \cap B(x^-(G_{wi}), \varepsilon_k) \subseteq I_{un_{k+m_k}} \cup I_{u(n_{k+m_k}-1)}$$

and

$$I_{v1} \subseteq E \cap B(x^+(G_{wi}), \varepsilon_k) \subseteq I_{v1} \cup I_{v2}.$$

From claim 2 we get

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{un_{k+m_k}}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{un_{k+m_k}} \cup I_{u(n_{k+m_k}-1)}) \text{ and } \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{v1}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{v1} \cup I_{v2}).$$

Since $x^-(G_{wi}), x^+(G_{wi}) \in E$ and $|x^-(G_{wi}) - x^+(G_{wi})| = \varepsilon_k$, it follows from the doubling property of $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ that $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x^-(G_{wi}), \varepsilon_k)) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x^+(G_{wi}), \varepsilon_k))$, so

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{un_{k+m_k}}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{v1}),$$

which, together with claim 4, yields $p_{k+m_k,n_{k+m_k}} \sim p_{k+m_k,1}$.

Case 2. $s_k > 1$ or $j > 1$. In this case, arguing as we did in claim 3, we get

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{un_{k+m_k}} \cup \cdots \cup I_{u(n_{k+m_k}+1-j)}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{v1} \cup \cdots \cup I_{vj}),$$

which, combined with claim 4, yields

$$p_{k+m_k,n_{k+m_k}} + \cdots + p_{k+m_k,n_{k+m_k}+1-j} \sim p_{k+m_k,1} + \cdots + p_{k+m_k,j}.$$

This completes the proof of claim 6 and the 'only if' part is thus proved.

Proof of the 'if' part. Suppose that $\mathbb{P}$ meets the conditions of Theorem 1. We are going to show that $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ is doubling on E.

Let $B(x,r)$ be a ball of the real line with $x \in E$ and $r \in (0,1)$. Let I be the smallest component such that $I \supseteq E \cap B(x,2r)$. Suppose that I is at the level $k-1$. Then $B(x,2r)$ intersects at least two components of level k, so $2r \ge \varepsilon_k$. Denote

$$\mathcal{A} = \{L : L \in \mathcal{I}_k,\ L \cap B(x,2r) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Then $\cup_{L\in\mathcal{A}} L \subseteq I$ and $4r \ge (\sharp\mathcal{A} - 2)\delta_k + (\sharp\mathcal{A} - 1)\varepsilon_k$, where $\sharp$ denotes the cardinality. We consider four cases as follows.

Case 1. $\sharp\mathcal{A} \ge 4$.

In this case, we see that $\sharp\mathcal{A} \sim \sharp\{L \in \mathcal{A} : L \subseteq B(x,r)\}$. Since P_k is C-uniform, we get $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,r)) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,2r))$.

Case 2. $\sharp\mathcal{A} = 3$.

In this case, $4r > \delta_k$. When $n_{k+1} \ge 4$, we see that $B(x,r)$ contains at least $[\frac{n_{k+1}}{4}]$ components of level $k+1$ in $L(x)$, where $L(x) \in \mathcal{A}$ is the component of level k containing x. Since P_{k+1} and P_k are C-uniform, we have

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,r)) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(L(x)) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,2r)).$$

When $n_{k+1} = 2$ or 3, we see from $\sharp\mathcal{A} = 3$ that $B(x,r)$ contains at least a component of level $k+1$. Therefore the last relationship remains true.

Case 3. $\sharp\mathcal{A} = 2$ and $\varepsilon_k \geq \delta_k$.

In this case, since $2r \geq \varepsilon_k$, we have $2r \geq \delta_k$. By the same argument as that of Case 2 we get $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,r)) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,2r))$.

Case 4. $\sharp\mathcal{A} = 2$ and $\varepsilon_k < \delta_k$.

Let I_{wi} and $I_{w(i+1)}$ be members of $\mathcal{A}$, where $w \in W_{k-1}$ and $1 \leq i < n_k$. Without loss of generality, assume that $x \in I_{wi}$. Let $J(x)$ be the biggest component such that $x \in J(x) \subseteq B(x,r)$. Then $J(x) = I$ or $J(x) \subseteq I_{wi}$. It is obvious that $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,r)) = \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,2r))$ for $J(x) = I$. Also, if $J(x) = I_{wi}$, we easily see from the C-uniformness of P_k that

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,r)) \geq \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wi}) \geq C\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wi} \cup I_{w(i+1)}) \geq C\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,2r)).$$

Next assume $J(x) \neq I_{wi}$. Thus $J(x)$ is at the level $k+t$ for some $t \geq 1$. Let I_u be the component of level $k+t-1$ containing $J(x)$, where $u \in W_{k+t-1}$. Then we have $B(x,r) \subset I_u \cup G \cup I_v$ and $r < \delta_{k+t-1}$ by the maximality of $J(x)$, where I_v is the nearest component of level $k+t-1$ on the right of I_u and G is the gap between I_u and I_v. Therefore, $B(x,2r)$ meets at most four components of level $k+t-1$, that is, $\sharp\mathcal{B} \leq 4$, where

$$\mathcal{B} = \{L : L \text{ is a component of } E_{k+t-1} \text{ and } L \cap B(x,2r) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Clearly, $I_u \in \mathcal{B}$. We claim that $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(L) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_u)$ for all $L \in \mathcal{B}$. In fact, let L and K be two adjacent components in $\mathcal{B}$, then the gap between L and K is at the level $k+j$ for some $0 \leq j \leq t-1$. When the gap is at the level $k+t-1$, we immediately get $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(L) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(K)$ from the C-uniformness of P_{k+t-1}. The gap being at the level $k+j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq t-2$ is possible only when

$$\varepsilon_{k+j} \leq 2r < 2\delta_{k+t-1} < \delta_{k+j},$$

and if it happened, we would have $m_{k+j} \geq t-1$. If $m_{k+j} = t-1$, then $s_{k+j} = 1$, so the (C, s_{k+j})-uniformness of $(P_{k+j+m_{k+j}}, P_{k+j+m_{k+j}})$ implies $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(L) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(K)$. If $m_{k+j} > t-1$, we may use the condition (11) to get $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(L) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(K)$. Finally, we consider the case where the gap is at the level k. Note that $t \leq m_k + 1$, in fact, if not, we would get from the definition of m_k that $2r \leq 2\delta_{k+m_k+1} < \delta_{k+m_k} \leq \varepsilon_k$, contradicting $2r \geq \varepsilon_k$. Also, if $t = m_k + 1$ happened, (P_{k+m_k}, P_{k+m_k}) would have been C-uniform. In fact, if $t = m_k + 1$ then $\delta_{k+m_k} \leq \varepsilon_k \leq 2r \leq 2\delta_{k+m_k}$ by the definition of m_k, so $s_k = 1$, and hence (P_{k+m_k}, P_{k+m_k}) is C-uniform, because it has been assumed to be (C, s_k)-uniform. Then $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(L) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(K)$ follows from the above discussion and the assumptions of theorem 1. This proves the claim.

Now let

$$\mathcal{C} = \{L : L \text{ is a component of } E_{k+t} \text{ and } L \subseteq I_u \cap B(x,r)\}.$$

Two possible subcases may happen.

Subcase 1. $B(x,2r) \supseteq I_u$.

In this subcase, we have $\sharp\mathcal{C} \geq [\frac{n_{k+t}}{2}]$. It follows from the C-uniformness of P_{k+t} that

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,r)) \geq C\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_u).$$

Since $\sharp\mathcal{B} \leq 4$, we get from the above claim that $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,r)) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,2r))$.

Subcase 2. $B(x,2r) \subset I_u \cup G \cup I_v$.

In this subcase, it is clear that $2r < |I_u| = \delta_{k+t-1}$, so we have $t \leq m_k$ by the definition of m_k. Observing that $I_u \subseteq I_{wi}$ and $I_v \subseteq I_{w(i+1)}$, with $u \in W_{k+t-1}$ being the maximal word with prefix wi and $v \in W_{k+t-1}$ being the minimal word with prefix $w(i+1)$, we see that G is a gap of level k. When $1 \leq t < m_k$, we use the assumption (a) to get $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,r)) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,2r))$. When $t = m_k$, remembering that s_k has been defined to satisfy

$$s_k\delta_{k+m_k} + (s_k-1)\varepsilon_{k+m_k} \leq \varepsilon_k < (s_k+1)\delta_{k+m_k} + s_k\varepsilon_{k+m_k},$$

which, together with $2r \geq \varepsilon_k$, yields $2r \geq s_k\delta_{k+m_k} + (s_k-1)\varepsilon_{k+m_k}$, we may use the C-uniformness of P_{k+m_k}, the (C,s_k)-uniformness of (P_{k+m_k}, P_{k+m_k}), and the assumption (11) to get $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,r)) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(B(x,2r))$. This completes the proof of the 'if' part.

3 Proof of Theorem 2

The proof of theorem 2 may go in step as that of theorem 1. For the proof of the 'only if' part, suppose that μ is doubling on the uniform Cantor set E. We shall prove that the sequence $\{P_w\}_{w\in W}$ satisfies the conditions of theorem 2. As we did in theorem 1, the proof consists of the following claims.

Claim A. $p_{w2} \leq Cp_{w1}$ and $p_{w(n_k-1)} \leq Cp_{wn_k}$ for all $w \in W_{k-1}$ and $k \geq 1$.

Claim B. $p_{wi} \sim p_{w(i+1)}$ for all $w \in W_{k-1}$, $1 \leq i < n_k$, and $k \geq 1$.

Claim C. P_w is C-uniform for all $w \in W$.

Claim D. $\prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{w(i+1)1^j} \sim \prod_{j=1}^{t} p_{wiu_j}$ for all $w \in W_{k-1}$, $1 \leq i < n_k$, $1 \leq t < m_k$, and $k \in \Lambda$.

Claim E. $(P_{wiu_{t-1}}, P_{w(i+1)1^{t-1}})$ is C-uniform for all $w \in W_{k-1}$, $1 \leq i < n_k$, $1 \leq t < m_k$, and $k \in \Lambda$.

Claim F. $(P_{wiu_{m_k-1}}, P_{w(i+1)1^{m_k-1}})$ is (C,s_k)-uniform for all $k \in \Lambda$.

If, for every fixed integer $k \geq 1$, the vectors P_w are the same for all $w \in W_{k-1}$, then the above claims are exactly those in theorem 1. Under this condition, *claim A* has a simpler proof, because the word $w \in W_{k-1}$ in question may be assumed to be the minimal or maximal words. Now, without assuming this condition, we are going to prove *claim A*. Instead, we will show the following

Lemma 1. *$p_{w2} \sim p_{w1}$ and $p_{w(n_k-1)} \sim p_{wn_k}$ for all $w \in W_{k-1}$ and $k \geq 1$.*

Proof of Lemma 1. We only prove $p_{w2} \sim p_{w1}$. The proof of the other relationship is obviously similar. Let $k \geq 1$ and $w \in W_{k-1}$ be given. To prove $p_{w2} \sim p_{w1}$, it suffices to show $\mu(I_{w2}) \sim \mu(I_{w1})$. Without loss of generality, assume that $w \in W_{k-1}$ is neither minimal nor maximal.

Case 1. $\varepsilon_k \geq \delta_k$.

Let I_u be the component of level k next to the left of I_{w1}. Let I_v be the component of level k next to the right of I_{w2}. Let G be the gap between I_u and I_{w1}. Let G' be the gap between I_{w2} and I_v. Then G' is a gap of level k if and only if $n_k > 2$. Remember that μ is doubling on E and that $\varepsilon_k \geq \delta_k$ has been assumed.

Noting that, if $\delta_k \leq |G| < \varepsilon_k$ then

$$I_{w1} = E_k \cap B(x^+(I_{w1}), |G|) \text{ and } I_u = E_k \cap B(x^-(I_u), |G|),$$

and that, if $|G| < \delta_k$ then

$$I_{w1} = E_k \cap B(x^+(I_{w1}), \delta_k) \text{ and } I_u = E_k \cap B(x^-(I_u), \delta_k),$$

we find that, if $|G| < \varepsilon_k$, then

$$\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_u). \tag{17}$$

Arguing as we just did, if $|G'| < \varepsilon_k$, then

$$\mu(I_{w2}) \sim \mu(I_v). \tag{18}$$

Now we apply (17) and (18) to prove $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$. We consider nine subcases.

Subcase 1. $|G| \geq \varepsilon_k$ and $|G'| \geq \varepsilon_k$.

Since $\varepsilon_k \geq \delta_k$ has been assumed, we have

$$I_{w1} = E_k \cap B(x^+(I_{w1}), \varepsilon_k) \text{ and } I_{w2} = E_k \cap B(x^-(I_{w2}), \varepsilon_k),$$

and so $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$.

Subcase 2. $|G| < \delta_k$ and $|G'| < \delta_k$.

In view of (17) and (18), $\mu(I_u) \sim \mu(I_{w1})$ and $\mu(I_v) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$. Since $|G'| < \delta_k \leq \varepsilon_k$, we have $n_k = 2$, as we have said. We see that the gap next to the right of I_v belongs to $\mathcal{G}_k$. Then we have

$$\mu(I_{w1}) + \mu(I_u) = \mu(B(x^+(I_u), \varepsilon_k + \delta_k))$$

and

$$\mu(I_{w2}) + \mu(I_v) = \mu(B(x^-(I_v), \varepsilon_k + \delta_k)),$$

and so $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$.

Subcase 3. $\delta_k \le |G| < \varepsilon_k$ and $|G'| \ge \varepsilon_k$.
In view of (17), $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_u)$. Observing that

$$I_{w1} \subseteq E_k \cap B(x^+(I_{w1}), \varepsilon_k) \subseteq I_u \cup I_{w1} \text{ and } I_{w2} = E_k \cap B(x^-(I_{w2}), \varepsilon_k),$$

we get $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$.

Subcase 4. $\delta_k \le |G'| < \varepsilon_k$ and $|G| \ge \varepsilon_k$.
Arguing as we just did in subcase 3, we have $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$.

Subcase 5. $\delta_k \le |G| < \varepsilon_k$ and $|G'| < \delta_k$.
We have $\mu(I_u) \sim \mu(I_{w1})$ and $\mu(I_v) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$. We also have

$$I_{w1} \subseteq E_k \cap B(x^-(I_{w1}), \varepsilon_k + \delta_k) \subseteq I_u \cup I_{w1}$$

and

$$\mu(I_{w2}) + \mu(I_v) = \mu(B(x^-(I_v), \varepsilon_k + \delta_k)),$$

and so $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$.

Subcase 6. $\delta_k \le |G'| < \varepsilon_k$ and $|G| < \delta_k$.
We get $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$ by an argument analogous to case 5.

Subcase 7. $\delta_k \le |G| < \varepsilon_k$ and $\delta_k \le |G'| < \varepsilon_k$.
We have $\mu(I_u) \sim \mu(I_{w1})$ and $\mu(I_v) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$. We also have

$$I_{w1} \subseteq E_k \cap B(x^-(I_{w1}), \varepsilon_k + \delta_k) \subseteq I_u \cup I_{w1}$$

and

$$I_{w2} \subseteq E_k \cap B(x^+(I_{w2}), \varepsilon_k + \delta_k) \subseteq I_v \cup I_{w2},$$

giving $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$.

Subcase 8. $|G| < \delta_k$ and $|G'| \ge \varepsilon_k$.
We have $\mu(I_u) \sim \mu(I_{w1})$. Noting that

$$I_{w2} = E_k \cap B(x^-(I_{w2}), \varepsilon_k) \text{ and } I_{w1} \subseteq E_k \cap B(x^+(I_{w1}), \varepsilon_k) \subseteq I_u \cup I_{w1},$$

we get $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$.

Subcase 9. $|G'| < \delta_k$ and $|G| \ge \varepsilon_k$.
Arguing as in case 8, we have $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$.

Case 2. $\varepsilon_k < \delta_k$, $n_{k+1} = 2$, and $\varepsilon_{k+1} \ge \delta_{k+1}$.

We consider two subcases: $\varepsilon_k < \delta_{k+1}$ and $\varepsilon_k \ge \delta_{k+1}$. When $\varepsilon_k < \delta_{k+1}$, one has $\mu(I_{w12}) \sim \mu(I_{w21})$ by comparing the sizes of $B(x^-(I_{w12}), \delta_{k+1})$ and $B(x^+(I_{w21}), \delta_{k+1})$ in measure μ, which, combined with an observation that $I_{w1} \subset B(x^-(I_{w12}), 2\varepsilon_{k+1})$, yields

$$\mu(I_{w1}) \le C\mu(B(x^-(I_{w12}), \varepsilon_{k+1})) \le C(\mu(I_{w12}) + \mu(I_{w21})) \le C\mu(I_{w2}).$$

As $\mu(I_{w2}) \le C\mu(I_{w1})$ may be obtained similarly, we have $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$. When $\varepsilon_k \ge \delta_{k+1}$, since $3\varepsilon_{k+1} \ge \delta_k > \varepsilon_k$ by the assumptions of case 2, one

also has $\mu(I_{w12}) \sim \mu(I_{w21})$ by comparing $B(x^-(I_{w12}), r_k)$ and $B(x^+(I_{w21}), r_k)$, where $r_k = \min\{\varepsilon_k, \varepsilon_{k+1}\}$. Therefore, arguing as in the previous subcase gives $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$.

Case 3. $\varepsilon_k < \delta_k$, $n_{k+1} = 2$, and $\varepsilon_{k+1} < \delta_{k+1}$.

Case 4. $\varepsilon_k < \delta_k$ and $n_{k+1} > 2$.

For cases 3 and 4, the proof of $\mu(I_{w1}) \sim \mu(I_{w2})$ is the same as that of claim 2 in section 2. We omit it. □

Based on lemma 1, *claims B - F* can be proved in the same way as *claims 2 - 6* of section 2. This completes the proof of the 'only if' part.

For the proof of the 'if' part, suppose that the sequence $\{P_w\}_{w\in W}$ satisfies the conditions of theorem 2. We have to prove that μ is doubling on the uniform Cantor set E. Arguing as we did in the proof of theorem 1, the doubling property of μ can be proved similarly, and so it is omitted here.

4 Proof of Theorem 3

Let $E = E(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{c}, \Lambda, \{m_k\}_{k\in\Lambda}, \{s_k\}_{k\in\Lambda})$ be a uniform Cantor set. The proof of Theorem 3 is based on the following lemmas.

Lemma 2. *If E carries a doubling measure which can be extended to a doubling measure on $[0,1]$, then $\{n_k c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \in \cup_{q\geq 1}\ell^q$.*

Proof. If $\{n_k c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \notin \cup_{q\geq 1}\ell^q$, then we have $\nu(E) = 0$ for all doubling measures ν on $[0,1]$ (see [5]), a contradiction. □

Lemma 3. *Suppose that E carries a doubling measure which can be extended to a doubling measure on $[0,1]$ and that $\sup_{k\geq 1} n_k < \infty$. Then $\sup_{k\in\Lambda} m_k = \infty$.*

Proof. If $\sup_{k\in\Lambda} m_k < \infty$, then there is an integer N such that $\varepsilon_k \geq \delta_{k+N}$ for all $k \geq 1$, i.e.

$$\prod_{i=k}^{k+N} \frac{1-(n_i-1)c_i}{n_i} \leq c_k.$$

It follows that

$$\left(\frac{1-\sup_{i\geq 1}(n_i-1)c_i}{\sup_{i\geq 1} n_i}\right)^{N+1} \leq c_k \tag{19}$$

for all $k \geq 1$. Since E carries a doubling measure which can be extended to a doubling measure on $[0,1]$, we have from Lemma 2 that $\{n_k c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \in \cup_{q\geq 1}\ell^q$. This implies $\sup_{k\geq 1}(n_k-1)c_k < 1$, which, together with (19) and the assumption $\sup_{k\geq 1} n_k < \infty$, gives $\inf_{k\geq 1} c_k > 0$. This implies that E is porous, so we have $\nu(E) = 0$ for all doubling measures ν on $[0,1]$ (see [18]), a contradiction. □

Proof of Theorem 3. Suppose $\{n_k c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \in \ell^1$. Then $\mathcal{L}(E) > 0$ by (4). Since $\mathbb{P}$ is an ultimately 1-uniform $\mathbf{n}$-matching probability sequence, there is an

integer $k_0 \geq 1$ such that $p_{k,i} = \frac{1}{n_k}$ for all $k \geq k_0$ and $1 \leq i \leq n_k$. By this, we have

$$\mu_{\mathbb{P}} = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_{k_0-1}} \frac{\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I)}{\mathcal{L}(E \cap I)} \mathcal{L}|_{E \cap I}.$$

Let

$$\nu = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_{k_0-1}} \frac{\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I)}{\mathcal{L}(E \cap I)} \mathcal{L}|_I + \sum_{J \in \mathcal{G}_{k_0-1}} \mathcal{L}|_J.$$

Since $\mathcal{I}_{k_0-1} \cup \mathcal{G}_{k_0-1}$ forms a partition of $[0,1]$ by finite intervals and the restrictions of the measure ν to these intervals are comparable to Lebesgue measure, we easily see that ν is doubling on $[0,1]$. Moreover, since $E \cap (\cup_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{k_0-1}} G) = \emptyset$, we have $\mu_{\mathbb{P}} = \nu|_E$. This proves that $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ can be extended to a doubling measure on $[0,1]$.

Conversely, suppose that $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ can be extended to a doubling measure ν on $[0,1]$. Then we have from Lemma 2 that $\{n_k c_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \in \ell^q$ for some $q \geq 1$, which yields $\lim_{k\to\infty} n_k c_k = 0$. We are going to show $\{n_k c_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \in \ell^1$.

Since $\lim_{k\to\infty} n_k c_k = 0$ and $\mathbb{P}$ is ultimately 1-uniform, we may choose an integer $k_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$n_k c_k < 1/3 \text{ for all } k \geq k_0 \tag{20}$$

and that

$$p_{k,i} = \tfrac{1}{n_k} \text{ for all } k \geq k_0 \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq n_k. \tag{21}$$

Therefore $\{k : k \geq k_0\} \subseteq \Lambda$, where Λ is as in (8). Let $k \geq k_0$ be fixed. By the definitions of integers m_k and s_k, we have

$$s_k \delta_{k+m_k} + (s_k - 1)\varepsilon_{k+m_k} \leq \varepsilon_k < (s_k + 1)\delta_{k+m_k} + s_k \varepsilon_{k+m_k}. \tag{22}$$

Since $\varepsilon_k = c_k \delta_{k-1}$ by the construction of the uniform Cantor set E, we see from (3) that the right-hand inequality of (22) can be rewritten as

$$c_k < \frac{(s_k+1)(1-(n_{k+m_k}-1)c_{k+m_k}) + s_k n_{k+m_k} c_{k+m_k}}{n_{k+m_k}} \prod_{i=k}^{k+m_k-1} \frac{1-(n_i-1)c_i}{n_i}.$$

Therefore

$$n_k c_k \leq \frac{3 s_k}{n_{k+1} n_{k+2} \cdots n_{k+m_k}}. \tag{23}$$

On the other hand, let $w \in W_{k-1}$, $1 \leq i < n_k$, and let $G_{wi} \in \mathcal{G}_k$ be the corresponding gap of level k. Then $|G_{wi}| = \varepsilon_k$. Let $J = [x^-(G_{wi}) - \varepsilon_k, x^-(G_{wi})]$ be an interval, where $x^-(G_{wi})$ is the left endpoint. We see from the left-hand inequality of (22) that J contains at least s_k components of level $k + m_k$ in I_{wi}. Since ν is an extension of $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}$ and ν is doubling on $[0,1]$, we get from (21) that

$$\nu(G_{wi}) \geq C\nu(J) \geq \frac{C s_k \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_{wi})}{n_{k+1} \cdots n_{k+m_k}}.$$

Now, summing over all $1 \le i < n_k$ yields

$$\nu(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_k-1} G_{wi}) \ge \frac{Cs_k}{n_{k+1}\cdots n_{k+m_k}} \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_k-1} I_{wi}). \tag{24}$$

Since $\mathbb{P}$ is ultimately 1-uniform, we have $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(\cup_{i=1}^{n_k-1} I_{wi}) \sim \mu_{\mathbb{P}}(I_w)$. Summing over all $w \in W_{k-1}$, we get from (23) that

$$\nu(\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{G}_k} J) \ge \frac{Cs_k}{n_{k+1}\cdots n_{k+m_k}} \ge Cn_kc_k$$

Finally, summing over all $k \ge k_0$ yields

$$\infty > \nu([0,1]) \ge \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \nu(\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{G}_k} J) \ge C\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} n_kc_k$$

This proves $\{n_kc_k\} \in \ell^1$.

Acknowledgement The authors wish to thank the referee for their valuable comments.

References

[1] S. M. Buckley, B. Hanson, and P. MacManus, Doubling for general sets, Math. Scand. 88 (2001), 229-245.

[2] M. Csörnyei, V. Suomala, On Cantor sets and doubling measures, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 393 (2012), 680-691.

[3] K. J. Falconer, Techniques in Fractal Geometry, John Wily & Sons, 1997.

[4] J. Garnett, Bounded Analytic Functions, Academic Press, 1981.

[5] D. Han, L. Wang, and S. Wen, Thickness and thinness of uniform Cantor sets for doubling measures, Nonlinearity 22 (2009), 545-551.

[6] J. Heinonen, Lectures on analysis on metric spaces, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., 2001.

[7] J. Luukkainen and E. Saksman, Every complete doubling space carries a doubling measure, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 126 (1998), 531-534.

[8] R. Kaufman, J. M. Wu, Two problems on doubling measures, Rev. Math. Iberoamericana 11 (1995), 527-545.

[9] A. Käenmäki, T. Rajala, and V. Suomala, Existence of doubling measures via generalized nested cubes, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 140 (2012), 3275-3281.

[10] L. V. Kovalev and D. Maldonado, Mappings with convex potentials and the quasiconformal Jacobian problem, Illinois J. Math., 49 (2005),1039-1060.

[11] L. V. Kovalev, D. Maldonado, and J. M. Wu, Doubling measures, monotonicity, and quasiconformality, Math. Z. 257 (2007), 525-545.

[12] T. Ojala, T. Rajala, and V. Suomala, Thin and fat sets for doubling measures in metric spaces, Studia Math. 208 (2012), 195-211.

[13] F. J. Peng and S. Y. Wen, Fatness and thinness of uniform Cantor sets for doubling measures, Sci. China Math. 54 (2011), 75-81.

[14] S. Staples and L. Ward, Quasisymmetrically thick sets, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 23 (1998), 151-168.

[15] P. Tukia, Hausdorff dimension and quasisymmetrical mappings, Math. Scand. 65(1989), 152-160.

[16] A. L. Vol'berg, S. V. Konyagin, On measures with the doubling condition, Math. USSR-Izv. 30 (1988), 629-638.

[17] W. Wang; S. Y. Wen; and Z. X. Wen, Note on atomic doubling measures, quasisymmetrically thin sets and thick sets, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 385 (2012), 1027-1032.

[18] J. M. Wu, Null sets for doubling and dyadic doubling measures, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. 18 (1993), 77-91.

[19] J. M. Wu, Hausdorff dimension and doubling measures on metric spaces, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 126 (1998), 1453-1459.

[20] P. L. Yung, Doubling properties of self-similar measures, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 56 (2007), 965-990.

Chun WEI and Zhixiong WEN
Department of Mathematics
Huazhong University of Science and Technology
Wuhan 430074, China

Shengyou WEN
Department of Mathematics
Hubei University
Wuhan 430062, China
E-mail address: sywen_65@163.com